UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,392	07/30/2003	Prasanna Amitabh	CHA920030017US1	9419

23550 7590 07/26/2007	EXAMINER
HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC	ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

75 STATE STREET	
14TH FLOOR	ART UNIT / PAPER NUMBER
ALBANY, NY 12207	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/630,392	AMITABH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Akiba K. Robinson-Boyce	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 May 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070711

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   Due to communications filed 5/7/07, the following is a final office action. Claims

1, 18 have been amended. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application and have been

examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been withdrawn, and the following

reflects the claims as amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth

in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the

prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention

was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability

shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-16, 18-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. i03(a) as

being unpatentable over Angel, (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0133392 A1)

(hereinafter Angel).

As per Claim 1, Angel discloses a customer relationship management (CRM) system

that is accessible via a network, comprising:

-a user interface that provides distributed access for customers and support providers

to case information within the CRM system, wherein the user interface provides access

to a customer case management page for viewing all cases opened for a given

customer and a case summary page for viewing details of individual cases stored within

the CRM system, (0025, w/ 0030, shows returned content list, in this case, it is obvious

that the page would create a viewing for a given customer. Even though Angel

describes information is being retrieved about customer service personnel, case

information, and details of the case are still being retrieved for an entity of that particular

network, thereby making this limitation obvious with Angel)

- a case management system for managing customer cases, wherein the case

management system includes a system for assigning cases to different tiers within a

support provider hierarchy; (0059; 0060; 0065; 0078; 0087; 0100) and

-a compliance tracking system that determines customer compliance and provides a

compliance indicator on customer case management pages. (0087) (Applicant's

specification states, "Obviously any [compliance] parameter can be implemented

without departing from the scope of the invention." (Specification, Pg. 9). Thus,

Examiner interprets "compliance" broadly as stated in applicant's specification. This

can include the parameter as to whether a customer should be receiving support from

the current support provider or another support provider. Examiner also interprets the

exit node disclosed in Angel as an indicator to the customer support representative that

the compliance parameter has not been met.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to view all cases opened for a given customer with the motivation

of allowing retrieval of case information for an entity connected to the immediate

network.

As per Claim 2, Angel further discloses the CRM system of claim 1, wherein the case

management system further includes a notification system for automatically generating

emails when a new case is opened. (0060; 0061; 0140) ·

As per Claim 3, Angel further discloses the CRM system of claim 1, wherein the case

management system further includes a system that allows support providers to check-

in/check\-out cases. (0039)

As per Claim 4, Angel further discloses the CRM system of claim 1, wherein the case

management system further includes a set of business rules that determines what level

of case information is to be made available to customers and support providers. (0044;

0045; 0046; 0114;.0124)

As per Claim 5, Angel further discloses the CRM system of claim 1, wherein the case

management system further includes a set of business rules that determines how cases

are to be assigned and escalated among the different tiers of support providers. (0059;

0065; 0087) (Examiner interprets "triggers" to include business rules that may be used

to activate a "handoff" to another tier of customer support.)

As per Claim 6, Angel further discloses the CRM system of claim 1, wherein the

compliance tracking system includes a set of business rules that determines a

compliance risk level for each customer. (0044; 0059)

As per Claim 9, Angel further discloses the CRM system of claim 6, wherein the

compliance tracking system includes a system for creating a new customer case when

a predetermined compliance risk level occurs. (0059; 0060)

As per Claim 10, Angel further discloses a method for providing customer relationship

management (CRM) via a computer network, comprising: .

-providing a network node that allows distributed access for customers and support

providers to a CRM System; (0043)

-opening a new case within the CRM system when a customer issue occurs; (0105;

0140) (A new user session or ticket is created and saved within a customer database.) -

adding the new case to a customer case management page; (0140)

- displaying a compliance indicator when the customer case management page is

viewed; (0087) (Includes an exit node indicator on the customer session page that

serves as a trigger to escalate the case to another tier when certain parameters are

met.)

- assigning the new case to a first tier support provider; (0039; 0059; 0065; 0087)

-determining if the first tier support provider can handle the new case; (0039; 0059;

0065; 0087) and

-escalating the new case to a second tier support provider if the first tier support

provider cannot handle the case. (0039; 0059; 0065; 0087)

As per Claim 11, Angel further discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the network

node comprises a web portal. (0025; 0080)

 As per Claim 13, Angel further discloses the method of claim 10, comprising the further

step of generating email notifications according to a set of business rules. (0060; 0061;
0140)

As per Claim 14, The method of claim 10, comprising the further step of having an

assigned support provider check out the case from the CRM system. (0039; 0065;

0077; 0087) (A first support provider determines the proper area for which to provide

service and then transfers the case. Examiner interprets transferring the case to another

support provider to include "checking out" the case from the prior provider.)

As per Claim 15, Angel further discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of

opening a new case is performed by the customer at the network node. (0059; 0061) (A

user initiates a session using a network, such as the Internet).

As per Claim 16, Angel further discloses the method of claim 10, wherein the step of

opening a new case is initiated automatically when the customer is out of compliance.

(0059) (When certain parameters are met, a new, escalated, customer session is

automatically initialized with another support provider.)

As per Claim 18, Angel further discloses a program product stored on a recordable

medium that provides a customer relationship management (CRM) tool via the web,

comprising:

-a portal page for providing distributed access on the web for customers and support

providers to case information within the CRM tool; (0025; 0039; 0059)

-a customer management module for managing customer cases and for assigning

cases to different tiers within a support provider hierarchy; (0059; 0065; 0099) and

-a customer compliance module that tracks customer compliance and displays a

compliance indicator on customer case management pages. (0059; 0065; 0087; 0099)

As per Claim 19, Angel further discloses the program product of claim 18, wherein the

case management module further includes a notification system for automatically

generating emails when a new case is opened. (0060; 0061; 0140)

As per Claim 20, Angel further discloses the program product of claim 18, wherein the

case management module further includes a system that allows support providers to

check-in/check-out cases. (0039)

As per Claim 21, Angel further discloses the program product of claim 18, wherein the

case management module further includes a set of business rules that determines what

level of case information is to be made available to customers and support providers.

(0044; 0045; 0046; 0114; 0124)

As per Claim 22, Angel further discloses the program product of claim 18, wherein the

case management module further includes a set of business rules that determines how

cases are to be assigned and escalated among the different tiers of support providers.

(0059; 0060; 0065; 0078; 0087; 0100)

As per Claim 23, Angel further discloses the program product of claim 18, wherein the

compliance tracking module includes a set of business rules that determines a

compliance risk level for each customer. (0044; 0059)

As per Claim 26, The program product of claim 23, wherein the compliance tracking

module includes a system for creating a new customer case when a predetermined

compliance risk level occurs. (0059) (When certain parameters are met, a new,

escalated, customer session is automatically initialized with another support provider.)

4.   Claims 7-8, 12, 17, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. i03(a) as being

unpatentable over Angel in view of Pope et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2003/0055737

A1) (hereinafter Pope).

        As per claims 7-8, 12, 17 and 24-25, Angel discloses mostly all of the limitations

including wherein the portal page provides access to a customer case management

page for viewing all cases opened for a given customer and a case summary page for

viewing details of individual cases as shown in 0030, where a returned content list is

shown.

        However, Angel fails to disclose wherein the compliance risk level is selected

from the group consisting of: in compliance, in danger of becoming out of compliance,

and out of compliance and also wherein the compliance indicator comprises a traffic

light indicator having a green, yellow and red light. Pope discloses a software

application that uses a stoplight indicator (green, yellow, red) to indicate the compliance

of a particular entity that a user wishes to perform an electronic transaction with. (0007;

0008; 0033) Pope further discloses that the green, yellow, and red lights indicate secure

(green), risk of security (yellow), and non-secure (red). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize the use of a

traffic light as taught by Pope in combination with the compliance indication taught by

Angel because the use of a traffic signal image to indicate levels of risk, status, or

compliance was well-known within the art of software development and serves as an

effective and universal means to indicate risk, status, or compliance within a software

application. Further, it would have been obvious to one Of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to choose compliance risk levels in compliance, danger of

becoming out of compliance, and out of compliance based upon the levels of secure,

risk of insecure, and non-secure as taught by Pope because based upon applicant's

broad definition of "compliance" (Specification, Page 9) the actual compliance

parameter could be any parameter in any industry including a security risk.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 5/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

As per claims 1, 18, applicant argues that Angel does not teach a case

management system for managing customer cases, but Angel merely provides a

system for submitting queries and retrieving content from one or more disparate

providers. However, in [0030], Angel discloses an example where a returned content

list is provided to include information about particular customer service personnel within

a content body, and their corresponding areas of expertise, and furthermore, based on

this descriptive information, the user could select one or more such human information

providers, and be linked to that provider. In this case, it is true that content is being

retrieved for a provider, however, the information on a particular customer service

personnel represents a case, and the customer service personnel represents the

customer, since according to dictionary.com, a case is defined as "a specific occurrence

or matter requiring discussion, decision, or investigation...", and in this situation,

investigation is being performed on the customer service provider. In this situation, even

though Angel describes information is being retrieved about customer service

personnel, case information, and details of the case are still being retrieved for an entity

of that particular network, thereby making this limitation obvious with Angel.

As per claim 10, applicant argues that nowhere does Angel teach or suggest

displaying a compliance indicator. However, in Paragraph 0087, Angel discloses an exit

node indicator on the customer session page that serves as a trigger to escalate the

case to another tier when certain parameters are met. In this case, the exit node is

triggered based on the fact that the customer is operating a particular hardware or

operating system, and therefore represents customer compliance.

For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 10 and 18, and claims that depend from

them are still rejected.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is

571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

•Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

A. R. B.
July 23, 2007